

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/615,159	Applicant(s) MADOU, MARC J.	
	Examiner ALEX NOGUEROLA	Art Unit 1753	

All Participants:

 (1) ALEX NOGUEROLA.

 (2) Corwin Horton.

Status of Application: Restriction

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 September 2003
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1-22

Prior art documents discussed:

none
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Mr. Horton elected the invention of Group I, claims 1-10 and 20-22, without traverse.
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EXAMINER'S CASE ACTION WORKSHEET

Application No.
09/615,159



Legal Instrument Examiner

CHECK TYPE OF ACTION

DATE OF COUNT

<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Final Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restriction/Election Only	<input type="checkbox"/> Final Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte Quayle	<input type="checkbox"/> Allowance	<input type="checkbox"/> Advisory Action
<input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Answer	<input type="checkbox"/> Reply Brief Noted	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Entry of Reply Brief
<input type="checkbox"/> Defective Notice of Appeal	<input type="checkbox"/> Interference Disposal SPE _____ (Approval for Disposal)	<input type="checkbox"/> Suspension (Examiner-Initiated) SPE _____ (initial)
<input type="checkbox"/> Defective Appeal Brief	<input type="checkbox"/> SIR Disposal (use only after FAOM)	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Examiner's Amendment
<input type="checkbox"/> Miscellaneous Office Letter (With Shortened Statutory Period Set)	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment (With One Month Time Period set)	<input type="checkbox"/> Miscellaneous Office Letter (No Response Period Set)
<input type="checkbox"/> Abandonment after BPAI Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Action (excluding Examiner's Answer)	<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Rule 312 Amendment
<input type="checkbox"/> Letter Restarting Period for Response (e.g., Missing References)	<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization to Change Previous Office Action SPE: _____ (Initial)
<input type="checkbox"/> Abandonment	<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Date: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____

Examiner's Name: ALEX NOGUEROLA

AU: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-10 and 20-22, drawn to a method of making a microfluidic device and an electrochemical cell, classified in class 430, subclass 311.
 - II. Claims 11-19, drawn to a microfluidic device and a sensing module, classified in class 204, subclass 409.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the claimed microfluidic device and sensing module can be made by LIGA (Lithographie, Galvanoformung, and Abformung). Indeed, Applicant's method of making a microfluidic device and an electrochemical cell is allegedly a less costly alternative to LIGA (page 14, second full paragraph of the specification).

2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.


Art Unit: 1753

3. During a telephone conversation with Corwin Horton on September 05, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10 and 20-22. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX NOGUEROLA whose telephone number is (703) 305-5686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NAM NGUYEN can be reached on (703) 308-3322. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


Alex Noguerola

9/05/03